# **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's Office Action of February 5, 2008 issued in relation to the present Patent Application, the Applicant submits the accompanying Terminal Disclaimer, Amendments to the claims, and the below Remarks.

Claims 1-3, 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21-26, 29-31, and 33 are presented for examination. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

#### **Amendments**

Claims 4-9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 27, 28 and 32 have been cancelled from the present application.

The claims have been amended to clarify that the present invention is directed to a monitor for connecting to an external computer. The term "monitor" is very well understood in the present field of technology as defining a separate device, thereby distinguishing the claimed invention from computer systems including a flat panel display and a printer, as well as devices that have inbuilt display screens.

## Regarding Claim objections

Claims 3, 10, 23, 27, 29, 30 and 31 have been amended to address the claim objections raised by the Examiner. Claims 5-8, 11, 18, 28 and 32 have been cancelled.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for highlighting these issues.

### Regarding Double Patenting Rejections

With respect to the Examiner's provisional statutory type double patenting rejection of claim 29 over claims 1 and 33 of copending Application No. 10/803073, it is believed that the amendments to claim 29, and claim 1 from which claim 29 depends, overcome the double patenting rejection by including features not recited in Application No. 10/803073.

With respect to the Examiner's provisional non-statutory double patenting rejection of claims 1-28 and 30-33 over claims 1, 2 and 5-35 of copending Application No. 10/803073, clams 1, 3, 4, 6-30 and 32 over claims 1-31 of US Patent No. 7,040,823, and claim 2 over claims 1 and 30 of US Patent No. 7,040,823 in view of US Patent No. 6,593,944, the Applicant submits herewith a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c), the present application, copending Application No. 10/803073, and US Patent No. 7,040,823 being commonly owned.

# Regarding 35 USC 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 9-14, 16, 19-22, 25, 26 and 31 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al. (US Patent No. 6,120,127).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to define a monitor for connecting to an external computer. The features from former claims 14, 16 and 19 have also been incorporated therein. With regards to the feature from former claim 16, that feature has been more clearly defined in that it is the printhead that is the width of a page, rather than defining a page-width printer. Support for this amendment may be found for example in last paragraph of page 21 and Figure 23.

Inoue does not disclose a monitor. Inoue discloses a recording apparatus including a processor unit, keyboard, printer and display screen.

Inoue also does not disclose a pagewidth inkjet printhead. The printhead disclosed in Inoue includes a moving printhead with a width significantly less than the width of the paper being printed on. A moving printhead results in the disadvantage that the printer, or printer unit, is bulky compared to the pagewidth printhead according to the present invention. Another disadvantage that results from a moving printhead is vibration as the printhead moves back and forth. Such vibration would cause discomfort to a user viewing the display whilst printing.

Claim 1, as amended is thus novel over Inoue. It is further submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Inoue in view of any of the prior art of record since all the features of independent claim 1, as amended, are not disclosed by the prior art.

The remainder of the claims presented for examination are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least that reason.

### Regarding 35 USC 103 Rejections

Claims 2 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Nicolas (US 6,593,944).

Claims 4-8, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Purpura (US 6,973,518).

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Purpura, and further in view of Nickum (US 7,003,279).

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Morikawa et al (US 6,771,388).

Appln No. 10/803077 Amdt. Dated: April 15, 2008 Response to Office Action of February 5, 2008

9

Claims 3, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Inoue in view of Silverbrook (US 5,984,446).

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view

of Purpura, and further in view of Silverbrook.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view

of Purpura, and further in view of Shenoy et al. (US Patent Application No. 2003/0197887).

The rejected claims are dependent on claim 1. Claims 4-9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 27, 28

and 32 have been cancelled from the application. The rejections of those claims are

therefore moot.

None of the references as applied by the Examiner discloses a monitor for

connection to an external computer and having all the features as defined in at least claim 1.

All the claims presented for examination are allowable for at least that reason

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and

reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

lus?

393 Darling Street

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762